DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 548 VT 010 203

TITLE	Correctional Staff Training Institutes. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. Office of Law Enforcement Assistance.; Southern Illinois Univ., East St. Louis. Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections.
PUB DATE	Jul 69
NOTE	101p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901 ($1.25)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.15
DESCRIPTORS	*Correctional Rehabilitation, Curriculum Guides, *Inservice Education, *Institutes (Training Programs), *Staff Improvement, Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

Three national institutes for correctional staff trainers incorporated new techniques in an attempt to upgrade corrections programs through improved staff development. There were 78 trainer and 200 middle management staff and correctional officers involved in the program, representing more than 100 correctional institutions in the United States. The institutes lasted for 8 weeks and were divided into three phases. During the first 5 weeks the participants attended laboratory sessions, lectures, discussions, demonstrations, and audio-visual programs. The next 2 weeks were used for a practice teaching period. Each individual was responsible for his own lessons and each selected appropriate teaching methods and evaluation programs for teaching sessions. The last week consisted of an intensive review of all the training material. A list of the training officers and a curriculum guide is appended. (BC)

ED037548

10.60.30
$1.25
(21)

FINAL REPORT

CORRECTIONAL STAFF TRAINING INSTITUTES

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
GRANTS NO. 241 AND 317

JOINTLY SPONSORED AND FINANCED BY THE:

OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE,
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

AND

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF CRIME,
DELINQUENCY, AND CORRECTIONS

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS

VT010203

ED037548

FINAL REPORT

CORRECTIONAL STAFF-TRAINING INSTITUTES

U. S. Department of Justice

Grants No. 241 and 317

July 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....ii

page

A. BACKGROUND, INTRODUCTION, AND PROJECT SUMMARY.. 1

B. PROJECT GOALS AND METHODS..... 7

C. PROJECT PERSONNEL..... 14

D. PROJECT TRAINING MATERIALS..... 19

E. TRAINEE REACTION: AN EVALUATION..... 24

APPENDIX I. PROJECT STAFF: RESIDENT AND VISITING..... 38

APPENDIX II. PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE FOR 1st INSTITUTE..... 43

APPENDIX III. PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE FOR 2nd INSTITUTE..... 60

APPENDIX IV. PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE FOR 3rd INSTITUTE..... 76

APPENDIX V. LIST OF SUPPLEMENTARY GRANT-PRODUCED MATERIALS ACCOMPANYING OFFICIAL FINAL REPORT..... 93

P R E F A C E

O.L.E.A. Grant No. 241 marks a significant step in bringing to bear the total resources of a major university on the problems and needs of modern corrections programming.

Following a developmental program sponsored by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (Grant No. 041), the present series of three national institutes for correctional staff trainers incorporated substantial new knowledge and techniques in a systematic attempt to upgrade corrections through improved staff development programs.

Seventy-eight trainer participants and over two hundred middle-management staff and correctional officers were involved in the institutes, thus representing an impact on more than one hundred correctional institutions nationwide.

We feel justified in believing that the institute series has engaged in a significantly positive interface with correctional practice and look forward to re-examining from time to time the persistence of gains made by correctional agencies as a result of this project. More important, perhaps, are the spinoff developments from the preparation of a professional trainer with each of forty-three state correctional systems. State legislation providing budgeted funds for training and educational leave, management seminars, and the development of locally oriented training materials of professionals are but a few of the multiple outcomes already observed.

Recognition for their individual and collective efforts is richly deserved by participating training officers. As a group, they became involved in the thrust of this project and served well our special need for help in developing ways through which "carryover" would be increased upon return to their "home" institutions. Middle-management and correctional officers likewise contributed to the eventual total impact of training by performing as both students and "guinea pigs."

Mr. Brooks was the Director of the project during its operational phase. Mr. Burns, who succeeded him in September of 1969, was largely responsible for the publication of training materials and the preparation of this report. The names and affiliations of participants are provided in the appendices.

Staff members of the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections participated in the project in varying degrees. Through the skilled efforts of our staff, consultants, and graduate assistants, we were in a position to develop and implement a complete training program.

Special recognition for our two Project Directors--Robert J. Brooks and Henry Burns, Jr.--is particularly merited. Their unstinting efforts and appreciation of project importance insured a program which was characterized by soundness of theoretical foundation, appropriateness of content and technique, and closeness to the realities and trends of modern corrections.

Appreciation for the professional, but totally understanding, relationships encouraged by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance cannot be overstated. Our special thanks are directed to Messrs. Daniel Skoler, Arnold Hopkins, and Frank Jasmine.

This Final Report provides a brief summary of our Project and a number of additional documents which were generated by its activities are attached to the first copy.

Charles V. Matthews

A. Background, Introduction, and Project Summary

Training, particularly in-service training, focuses on present problems. However, in-service training is also concerned with the future. Along with the concern for present and future is the task of facing daily--built-in--problems. These are found in any program. If change is involved, the problems are magnified. Change is difficult in most walks of life; however, in corrections change seems to be the most painful of all phenomena.

Today, corrections is undergoing fermentation throughout the country. This has created a need. Part of that need, simply stated, is training for change. This theme is present not only in corrections, but in virtually every occupation and profession. Industry is calling for a higher level of education and skill among its workers. There is a great need for professionals and technicians in education, health, counseling, and other community services. The need is far greater than the rate at which the educational system can produce them. Continuous studies are underway evaluating manpower resources. Indeed, the manpower problem is becoming critical. In terms of present

needs, it is already critical. At no place is this more true than in the field of corrections.

The Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois conducted a pilot-training program for correctional staff trainers in 1967. Made possible by Office of Law Enforcement Assistance Grant #041, the institute took place prior to the present series of institutes for which this report is made. This first institute was held from March 20 through May 19, 1967. It consisted of a nine-week program bringing together institutional training officers from a number of midwestern states.

For the most part, these individuals were classified as state training officers for specific institutions. In one instance the person represented a larger--departmental level--statewide body. Each person in attendance for the nine-week period had been designated--by his own agency--as a staff training officer prior to having been nominated to attend the program.

In addition, middle-management personnel attended from the same state institutions wherever possible. A limited number of correctional officers who were new to the field also participated. Middle management attended for

one week--the last of the nine in the institute. Correctional officers attended the seventh and eighth week.

States represented in the first institute were Texas, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Dakota. A total of seventeen training officers attended the nine-week program. Indiana, Kansas, and Tennessee each sent two. The remaining states sent one each. Some came from maximum security--penitentiary type--institutions and some came from the reformatory type. In all instances they represented adult institutions. In addition, forty-four correctional officers and thirteen representatives of middle-management participated through attendance of selected institute segments.

The term "staff training officer" as used here designates a person whose total effort would normally be devoted to personnel training. However, in many cases this individual is one nominated to serve in a training role but who, in large part, does this as only one of several tasks to which he has been assigned. Many serve as "extra officers" who participate in pre-service training for new employees and have no in-service training responsibility. Even this they do only infrequently due to recruitment

characteristics of the particular state and institution. During the remainder of his duty time, the person in this slot will serve as relief officer, escort for trip, or as a staff person available to perform any additional tasks for which a full-time man is not required.

The term "middle management" was used only during the first institute and referred to personnel in the Lieutenant to Deputy Warden range. Later, the term was abandoned in favor of "correctional administrator". The range of coverage extended upward to include those in the Deputy Warden and Assistant Superintendent--to Commissioner category.

For the first six of the nine weeks, participants engaged in various types of learning experiences previously reported in the final report for Grant #041, and for which further description is not necessary here. The remaining three weeks were divided into two weeks of teaching and one week during which the middle-management personnel were brought to the University to participate in the training program. During the two-week teaching experience, correctional officers were brought from the institutions represented by the training officers. They served as students and were taught by the nine-week participants. They departed at the end of two weeks. At the same time the middle-management people arrived for the final institute week.

From experience gained in conducting the first institute, certain changes were made in the application for another grant to carry out three institutes during the 1967-68 fiscal year. One of the most notable changes was in length of time. The first institute had lasted a total of nine weeks; however, the new series was planned for eight weeks each. The first five weeks included small team learning experiences and group lectures. Following this were two weeks of practice teaching and one week during which administrators from the home institution or agency participated.

The first institute in the new series of three began on October 2, 1967. Advance preparations had been made for a total enrollment of twenty. In addition to this number would be the attendance during the 6th and 7th weeks of up to two correctional officers from each parent institution. And, during the final week, administrators were scheduled for attendance.

As with the pilot institute, the time during which correctional officers were present was for practice teaching experience by the training officers. The correctional officers were students and training officers served as teachers. During the administrators' phase--the final

week--each management representative became acquainted with the type of program being presented. In addition, this provided a time for the individual staff trainer and his administrator to participate in long-range planning. Seminar-type group discussions during the final week gave all a chance to hear first-hand opinions from persons with widely varied backgrounds.

For this new series of three institutes, nominations were to be accepted from the entire fifty United States. Questionnaires were sent nationwide, and responses indicated there would be more than enough nominations to fill all three institutes. Favorable indications came from as far away as Alaska and Hawaii. All corners of the contiguous forty-eight states were interested--Florida, Maine, California, and Oregon. In the final count, forty states were represented in the series of four institutes covering the two-year period.

Change is taking place in corrections. Only time will tell what changes will result from this series of training institutes. The purpose of this report is to present a chronology of events that took place during the period of time participating training officers were engaged in the learning experience. It may also serve as a basis for possible further study. For example, what

was the effect of these experiences on the total correctional effort in the "home" institution or agency. There is a saying that the "proof of the pudding is in the eating." Maybe in this case it would be best to say that such proof should be analyzed by finding out later how it was digested. Training at the University's Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections was only the beginning. What happened after these individuals returned to their home locality is more important. That will have to be a part of some future report. Hopefully, it will be made.

B. Project Goals and Methods

The thrust of this program, as with the previous one, is three-fold. The first is directed specifically at the training officer. He must teach, coordinate, participate--or do all three of these in the instruction effort for line personnel. A second is directed toward the middle and upper-level management supervisor and administrator whose support and encouragement guide the training officer. This is a requisite part of the training program if any subsequent progress is to be made. The third thrust is toward developing a pool of trained correctional officers.

These officers received a short, very intensive training experience. This was programmed to occur in enhanced circumstances calculated to provide the latest in instructional techniques and thinking in corrections.

Early in the planning phase, project staff decided that structure and organization of each learning experience should lend itself to a realistic goal. The overall goal was simply to increase the capacity for effective teaching on the part of each participant. Institute design gave special emphasis to methods with which staff-trainers were not generally familiar, plus subject matter incorporating the best in current correctional philosophy and understanding. Educational mechanisms best suited for stimulating the trainers to learn were emphasized. A successful program was felt to require maximum contact between instructional staff and the trainees; thus, Saturday and evening activities supplement regular weekly curriculum activities.

The eight-week institute was divided into three phases. The initial five weeks consisted of preparation and development, the sixth and seventh week for performance, and the final week for an intensive summary of all previous activities. Evaluation, a constant part of our program,

took the form of a critical analysis of each individual by fellow trainers, assessments by project staff, and review by the operations analyst.

To gain a clearer perspective, we will examine these three segments separately. Each day of the first five weeks was divided into three distinct portions, not necessarily equal in time or content. Mornings were devoted to "content" type of learning experience including lectures, discussions, demonstrations, and other activities designed and conducted by staff and outside consultants. Afternoons were designated as "laboratory sessions" and used exclusively for small group or "team" meetings in which the training officer participant met daily with a group or "team" leader (the latter a member of Center faculty). The number of training officer participants in each "team-group" was usually seven. Evenings were taken up by audio-visual types of learning experiences and other supplementary programs.

Generally, the morning periods were well received. Some instructors were better able to meet the expectations and learning level of trainees than others. Individual training officers were asked to keep an accurate record of their reactions to all phases of the entire program. These records were kept daily and submitted each week to the project staff. Naturally, some individual presentations particularly

intrigued and interested the participants. Some lecturers utilized approaches designed to help the officer recognize and understand a variety of classroom procedures. Some of these were especially appropriate to the situation he would face in training "back home". Substantial use was made of audio-visual tape materials, blackboard diagramming, use of case history materials and other devices. All of these involved participants in their own learning experience.

Morning sessions usually meant a large group classroom experience during which new materials and new subject matter were often prepared. In contrast, the afternoons were informal and individualized. Called laboratory periods, afternoon sessions are best characterized as developmental. Training officers could ask questions more freely, explore peer group and individual reactions to the morning lecture, or obtain reactions to their own particular point of interest. Interactions on a small team basis with his colleagues from other states was--in and of itself--an exciting and truly enlightening experience. Afternoons also gave the officer a chance to catch his breath and digest instructions he had been receiving. In addition, it provided time during which considerable attention could be

devoted to discussing goals of training and different methods appropriate to attaining those goals.

A large portion of each afternoon session was devoted to the actual technology of lesson preparation. This, as time passed, became more and more a main focus of attention on the part of individual officers. Each participant was required to prepare and perform as a teacher during the sixth and seventh week. The two-week curriculum had to be planned, individual lessons assigned; and, actual teaching materials developed by participants. Pressure for satisfactory performance slowly evolved during the afternoon segment. Lesson plan preparation and content formulation was approached gradually. The purpose here was an attempt to relieve anxiety. A certain amount would naturally develop in a group of people brought together in this manner; however, by utilizing small teams and close personal identification with a team leader, a kind of esprit developed helping to motivate and maintain behavior appropriate to the goals of the institute.

The requirement that each training officer become a teacher served as an incentive. Each individual participant was motivated to prepare himself as best he could. This required him to work diligently in designing his portion of the curriculum for the two-week practice teaching period.

He was individually responsible for his own lessons, selecting necessary audio-visual aids where appropriate and arranging means of evaluating his own work. Evaluation proved to be an additional learning experience. This was true for the teacher, for the other training officers, and for the class of correctional officers as well. Of course, prior to the actual teaching experience each staff-trainer made numerous "dry runs" for the team leader and other members of the afternoon laboratory group.

Evenings during the first of the three institutes were largely utilized for viewing films. These periods provided the training officer an opportunity to familiarize himself with the range and types of audio-visual materials available for use. As expected, they reacted favorably to some and unfavorably to others. In the second and third training institutes, evening periods became more varied and included presentations other than audio-visual. There were provocative lectures, discussions and other activities. Evening sessions were limited to a one-hour period so that officers would have sufficient time for reference reading and relaxation. A listing of basic and supplementary instructional materials can be found in the appendix of this report.

The final institute week brought the administrators representing "parent" institutions and agencies of the training officers. This week provided an opportunity for their participation in a special program of instruction with time for critique and joint planning. Training officers presented sample lessons to the administrators and in turn were critiqued by not only their fellow training officers, but their own administrators as well. Additional special sessions were attended by all--training officers, administrators, and the Center faculty. Some presentations were by outside consultants brought to the campus for this week only.

The training officers, when they reach the eight-week point, are nearing completion of a course which has taken them away from their work and family for almost two months. They have just completed a teaching experience which could be viewed as a climax to the course. It should be remembered that they prepared for that teaching experience for five weeks. Then they taught for two weeks. Finally, when their administrators arrive, they are "over the hump" and see in the distance home and new duties. The administrators, on the other hand, arrive for this week only. It is a strange melting pot--a rare mixture--and has great potential for change.

C. Project Personnel

The Project (Grant #241) was funded by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance. Officially approved on September 21, 1967, it was made retroactive to September 1, 1967. The program built upon and--in some manner--continued work begun in the previous project (O.L.E.A. Grant #041) begun in 1966 and funded for a two-year period. Although reported separately, there are elements of shared personnel and resources common to both projects. Additionally, a large element of resource sharing with other programs of the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections is evident.

In July 1967, Robert J. Brooks, Center faculty member since 1962, was named Project Director. Henry Burns, Jr., a veteran of O.L.E.A. Project #041, was assigned as an instructor. Duncan Mitchell, a Design Department graduate of SIU, was named instructional materials coordinator. At about this time, additional efforts were undertaken to recruit for the remaining faculty personnel positions and supportive secretarial assistance.

In late September, two additional staff positions were filled. Fleary P. Samples was recruited as an instructor, and James E. Adams was employed to fill the administrative assistant position. Although additional candidates were

interviewed during September, October, and November, no additional appointments were made. Several positions remained unfilled during the first institute. In December, Richard Pooley was employed as an instructor. Mr. Pooley filled this position during the balance of the contract period. At about the same time, Peter Rompler was retained as a consultant on a one-day-a-week basis to provide some of the evaluation service. Later Mr. Rompler accepted full-time employment with the project.

Since the Project called for graduate students to become intimately involved in implementation of the training, recruitment began for these individuals. Immediate concern was for finding people of established academic performance plus a genuine interest in the field of corrections and promise of ability to work well with trainees that would come to this project. Final selection of graduate students--later named research assistants--represented a cross-disciplinary group. Mainly from the social sciences, they came representing the College of Education, Rehabilitation Institute, Design Department, and the Department of Government. All were brought into close continuing contact with correctional personnel and with institutional programs; thus providing very specialized study for both.

Our instructors were largely responsible for the success or failure of our crucial afternoon sessions. Relying

on small group techniques, each instructor was able to effectively mesh content sessions of the morning with the individual and collective needs of our participants. Attitudes were explored and opportunities presented for constructive "ventilation". Thus, in many respects, project instructors assumed the role of group leaders and facilitators.

Research Assistants

A basic concern of the Center is development of professional staff resources. This project sought to enlarge upon and test new strategies for providing graduate educational experiences in addition to formal academic work. It is recognized that there exists an urgent need to provide students with responsible roles relevant to the work of corrections. For those supported in this project there was a varied assignment of roles and tasks. They performed tasks in the organization and development of training media, bibliographic research, teaching, scoring and interpreting evaluation instruments, audio-visual projections, as film discussants, aiding in the registration and accommodations of arriving trainees, as coordinators for correctional conferences and meetings, and in the preparation

of written lecture notes and summaries from the institute sessions.

Indeed, the research assistants occupied a unique position, both as participants and as staff. Program design included roles which recognized (1) the need to support and develop professionals for correctional positions, and (2) the needs of this project in terms of instruction, materials development, and supportive services.

Duties varied somewhat between individuals and between different institutes. For example, beginning with the first and as a continuing task, one research assistant previewed and scheduled films for use in each institute. He evaluated them and made recommendation for purchase to expand the correctional film library of the University. Another revised and brought to completion a slide-tape presentation entitled "The Development of Corrections." He organized the sequence, added to the already existing collection and wrote an accompanying script. Another surveyed the literature on simulation training and--employing this approach--designed a correctional training exercise. His work was completed in written form and has been accepted for publication in 1969.

These examples are to a certain degree typical. Attempts were made to find useful capacities which would involve each student on an individual basis as much as possible. During subsequent institutes, research assistants assumed supportive roles on a one-to-one basis with training officer participants. On the other hand, there were times when research assistants, as well as project staff, served for brief periods in routine roles. These included picking up supplies, meeting participants at the airport, and greeting visitors and newly arrived institute participants for the two-week and one-week periods. They worked several weekend shifts in this endeavor. In a more academic capacity, the research assistants compiled notes on the morning lectures and discussions. After writing, review, and revision, these were duplicated and incorporated as part of "Tools for Trainers".

The range and variety of services that research assistants performed was great. (Some--of course--became more involved than others.) Considerable cross-learning took place. Our original belief was that research assistants would enlarge their understanding of correctional systems and their personnel. It was felt that this actually took place in most instances. On the other hand, it was

expected that the individual training officer would, through his association with the research assistant, become better acquainted and more closely identified with the University and its programs.

A complete listing of staff can be found in the appendix. This compilation includes full-time staff and other Center personnel, research assistants, plus consulting and other part-time help.

D. Project Training Materials

During the series of three institutes, much material was gathered. A constant process of evaluation culled out the chaff, leaving only the more useful instructional aids. These took the form of innovations in teaching--testing materials and techniques--but most importantly, the collective experiences of those participants who came from such widely varying types of backgrounds provided the richest resource. Much of this was captured on film, paper, and through word-of-mouth communications. An additional role of the project was that of dissemination.

Early in each institute the search would begin for additional instructional training materials. Each training officer was faced with an assignment involving composing a series of lesson plans and presentation of

these in the presence of his fellow participants. Thus, a participant was motivated to prepare himself as best he could. With each subsequent experience, staff became more aware of the need for developing training materials, a feeling tacitly acknowledged in present-day correctional practice. In an effort to meet that need (and particularly the immediate requirements of those officers) "loose-leaf method" was initiated for compiling a collection of duplicated materials produced by each institute.

This loose-leaf collection (later entitled "Tools for Trainers") eventually contained three categories of materials. The first covered morning lecture and discussion sessions. Some of this material included summary notes taken by research assistants. In other cases it was the complete manuscript from which the instructor took portions for his lecture and discussion. The second category covered general resources for the training officers. These included practical topics such as where films could be obtained, what library material should be recommended for a staff library and where general correctional information would be available. The third section was devoted to lesson plans prepared by the trainees themselves. During the fall institute there were 129 separate lesson plans prepared including 3 different plans for each of 43 topics

presented during the two-week teaching experience. The final two institutes added to this collection, modifying and supplementing those already written. A continuous quality control effort was exercised by Center staff.

In preparation throughout the series of institutes was the development of two "Slide-tape" presentations: (1) "Alternatives to Incarceration", and (2) "The Development of Corrections". The latter traces the history of Western European and American approaches to handling of offenders. Its format consists of 101 slides providing a visual summary of two hundred years of changing architecture and programs in corrections.

A listing of these and other training materials produced during and after the institutes follows:

The Development of Corrections: A series of more than a hundred slides designed as a training tool for all levels of correctional personnel. It is accompanied by a script, suggestions for use, and a bibliography.

Tools for Trainers, Vol. I, Training Topics: The first one of three loose-leaf deskbooks for the trainer. This volume presents some twenty relevant topics in an in-depth review.

Tools for Trainers, Vol. II, Resources for Training: A dozen sections in this volume pinpointing specific resources for the trainer. Films, text, correspondence study, case training materials, and other tools are presented in ready reference form.

Tools for Trainers, Vol. III, Lesson Plans: More than a dozen imaginative lesson plans illustrative of the many approaches useful in presenting subject matter.

Designing and Developing the Training Unit: An illustrated manual designed to serve the training officer who plans remodeling existing space to serve training functions. Detailed plans for installing a comprehensive audio-visual unit are presented.

Contingency Reinforcement in Correctional Training: From research completed during the institutes, data was abstracted and is presented in a manual of principles. The use of appropriate reinforcers is explained and the methodology for incorporation of these principles in a training program explored.

Project LEAP in 16 mm: A 300 foot 8 mm., silent film was edited and transferred to 16 mm. film. It focuses on training experiences in the recently completed series of institutes, with implications for general application of key principles.

Alternatives to Incarceration: A series of 75 slides accompanied by a script narration provides a 30-minute training presentation. Slides are prepared from original drawings and from on-site photographs.

Readings in Training: A series of articles on correctional training is still in preparation. This will consist of published materials brought together into an anthology to be edited and introduced for a one volume printed product.

Each of the project-generated materials has been previously forwarded to L.E.A.A. and to institute participants. Additional copies are available from the Center at minimal cost. One copy of each item produced is also attached to the official Final Report for L.E.A.A.

A small selection of text and reading materials was provided to which the officers could refer throughout the course. These included two reports of the President's Commission of Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice: The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society and Task Force Report: Corrections. Additionally, a basic text entitled Crime, Correction and Society by Elmer H. Johnson and Alternatives to Incarceration by Lamar Empey were furnished. Later, paperbacks entitled Preparing Instructional Objectives by Robert F. Mager and Crime in America prepared by the National Observer, were issued. However, a wide variety of inexpensive and sometimes free pamphlet-type publications were added. Of course, other teaching materials were duplicated as needed and given to the trainees. They utilized the small Center library and, as needed, the larger University library for further research and study.

E. Trainee Reaction: An Evaluation

The objective success of any training program can best be determined by measuring its influence upon the trainees. In the final analysis, the trainee defines the parameters of progress. He may accept or reject instruction; he may resist; he may assimilate new concepts with his previous experience; he may synthesize what he regards as "the best of both" for purposes of innovation. He may, in fact, selectively exhibit all of these reactions during the course of an eight week institute!

The wide range of possible individual reaction suggests caution in generalizing to all training and correctional officers. Students in this program were selected for their reputations as change-agents acceptable to their own prison systems. Consequently, a scientific selection criteria was of secondary importance to the matter of assuring that institute participants were psychologically attuned to study at a university. The participants were homogeneous in terms of previous experience with university culture, level of professionalization, age, and familiarity with student tasks. They shared similar attitudes toward the functions and purposes of the prison as a social institution.

The faculty rejected the usual practice of subjecting correctional specialists to course content essentially derived from an undergraduate catalog. Each instructor was to come from behind the "teacher's desk" and confront the students' needs in terms of subject matter particularly applicable to the role of a trainer in the field. Because the faculty had been recruited for their special competence in corrections, they were equipped to bridge the "gap" between theory and practice. This mission, however, was somewhat unprecedented in university circles. As a consequence, the faculty frequently encountered unfamiliar events in the course of teaching. There was a special concern to evaluate the outcome of this teaching situation in which the faculty had no fully germane precedent.

The Center wished to exploit experience gained in these institutes in order to enhance effectiveness of any related future projects. Although selective criteria may be especially pertinent to institutes in general, there is interest in the learning experiences of a group which was more homogeneous than is usually encountered in higher education. A better understanding of this homogeneity might help to cope with personnel problems crucial to all aspects of penal reform.

Finally, the faculty resolved to take a somewhat experimental stance toward the daily activities mounted to achieve pre-determined general goals. The staff was prepared to undertake short-term revisions of its approach when face-to-face contact with students indicated that modifications were desirable.

Content Analysis--Daily Logs

Under these circumstances, the usual psychometric measures were not appropriate. The staff felt that familiar instruments would be too inflexible because they had not been developed for this group of trainees and the circumstances of these institutions. For this particular population of students, a less sophisticated methodology seemed best.

In order to estimate the overall effect of the institute, and for immediate day-to-day monitoring of efforts, all participants in the training institutes were asked to keep a daily log. These were collected at the end of each week and made available to faculty. Changes in presentation, style and content occasionally resulted when the participants' comments seemed valid.

Although designed primarily to aid the faculty in evaluating trainee attitudes, these diaries were scrutinized formally. The daily logs from each of the three institutes were divided into five weekly components. The analysis focuses on the trainees as a group. Their comments were ranked according to frequency by the operations analyst and graduate assistants.

The "categories" in Table 1 are simply a compendium of responses received from students arranged by incidence and frequency.

Table 1 suggests several points:

1. In conformity with staff expectations qualities frequently found among practitioners, the trainees recorded a high concern for content and procedure categories. They tend to think and work primarily on a concrete level. Their comments were more likely to center attention on the actual content or style of presentation in a given class session. The theoretical points were less likely to be recognized.

2. There was a noteworthy shift from week to week in the relative emphasis placed on other categories. This shift could reflect differences among instructors or their instructional topics in terms of success in communicating with students. However, it is also possible that this flux

TABLE 1: INCIDENCE (I = F/N) WEEK BY WEEK; MEAN INCIDENCE and RANK ORDER BY MEAN INCIDENCE OF CATEGORIES

LEA INSTITUTE, FALL 1967.

Rank	Category	Incidence (I), Week:					Mean I
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Content	6.1	5.9	4.3	5.0	4.3	5.12
2	Positive Eval.	6.4	6.6	4.1	3.5	3.3	4.8
3	Procedure	6.9	3.8	0.18	3.1	1.4	3.4
4	Criticism	2.8	2.1	1.1	3.7	1.0	2.14
5	Suggestions	1.35	1.06	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.8
6	Future Utility	0.41	0.35	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.27
7.5	New Ideas	0.35	0.29	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.25
7.5	Confusions	0.35	0.29	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.25
9.5	Integration with previous know.	----	----	----	0.1	----	0.02
9.5	Exchange with other TO's	0.06	0.06	----	----	----	0.02

LEA INSTITUTE, WINTER 1968.

Rank	Category	Incidence (I), Week:					Mean I
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Content	3.33	3.27	5.55	3.27	5.50	4.12
2	Positive Eval.	3.5	2.94	5.08	2.33	4.25	3.62
3	Procedure	2.0	1.14	1.4	1.26	1.5	1.46
4	Criticism	1.89	1.28	0.73	2.0	1.0	1.38
5	New Ideas	0.89	0.67	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.87
6	Future Utility	0.72	0.73	1.0	0.53	1.0	0.76
7	Suggestions	0.89	0.6	0.07	1.0	1.0	0.73
8	Confusions	0.61	0.53	0.47	1.0	0.75	0.67
9	Integration with previous know.	0.89	0.2	0.2	0.53	0.25	0.41
10	Exchange with other TO's	0.17	0.07	0.33	0.13	0.25	0.19

LEA INSTITUTE, SPRING 1968.

Rank	Category	Incidence (I), Week:					Mean I
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Content	9.2	11.8	16.0	6.2	9.5	10.5
2	Procedure	8.6	12.1	12.8	7.4	8.9	10.0
3	Positive Eval.	6.7	8.8	10.9	6.5	8.4	8.3
4	Criticism	4.0	6.3	3.7	1.8	5.1	4.2
5	Future Utility	0.9	1.9	1.3	0.6	0.5	1.4
6.5	New Ideas	0.7	1.5	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.96
6.5	Suggestions	1.9	0.7	1.0	0.5	0.7	0.96
8	Integration with previous know.	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.05	0.05	0.22
9	Confusions	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.16
10	Exchange with other TO's	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.05	0.0	0.09

is related to reorientation of the students' perspective in selection of criteria to evaluate the work of instructors. Many of the trainees were inexperienced in performing such evaluation.

3. The rank order of some categories remained more stable than the rank order of other categories. It is noteworthy that the rankings varied more from week to week within a given institute than they varied between institutes. The trainees underwent changes in orientation as the weeks proceeded. These changes are of crucial importance because we are concerned with, first, the initiation of change in viewpoint and, second, that the change progress toward consistency with the ultimate goals of the project. A central question is the differential rates of change among the several categories in Table 1. To measure the rates of change, we employed the coefficient of variablility (standard deviation divided by the mean) for each of the categories along the week-by-week continuum.

4. One interesting development was that some categories received the highest attention in weeks three and five while other categories peaked in weeks two and four. Peaking was revealed through preparation of sight graphs and confirmed through calculation of rank-order

correlations. We found these categories peaked in weeks numbersthree and five: content, positive evaluation, procedure, new ideas, future utility, and exchange of ideas. We call these "productivity categories". The following categories peaked in weeks two and four: criticism of program, suggestions, confusion, and integration with previous knowledge. Because "criticism" and "confusion" are included, we call them "nonproductivity categories".

5. When "suggestions" and "integration" are removed to create clearly-defined nonproductivity categories, we found they were inversely correlated with the productivity at a level of statistical significance. In other words, "confusion" and "criticism of the program" were particularly marked when the several productivity categories were absent. This pattern is evidence of the flux in orientation experienced by the students. The dominance of productivity categories in the fifth week supports the staff observation that a positive consensus was characteristic of the students as the institute moved toward termination.

6. "Integration with previous knowledge" and "suggestions" were not correlated significantly with other productivity categories. The low ranking of these categories

is consistent with staff expectations because both suggest a degree of intellectual initiative unlikely to be produced in the course of only five weeks of experience with material and concepts unfamiliar to the bulk of the participants. The objective of the Center was to provide learning experiences which would be digested upon return to the prison system from which the participant had been drawn. There, he could assess these experiences within the environment of his system and his status within it. In this way, we hoped that the student would select from a variety of experiences those most germane to his role in that particular prison setting. In this way, the difficulties of a heterogeneous population of students would be overcome to a reasonable degree.

7. The fourth week of the Fall institute presents a particularly interesting pattern. Positive evaluation was continuing its decline. Concern with procedure had risen from the previous week and criticism had peaked. Observations of staff report increased frustration at the routine of student life. There were complaints about unaccustomed absence from family, the quality of housing in comparison with personal living habits, the role of student in light of their age, and the expectations that they learn

principles underlying course content. There was discontent with what they regarded as the tendency of faculty to avoid answering questions. Instructors would cite other questions behind the student's query to demonstrate the significance of issues raised.

The bottoming of productivity categories in the fourth week appears to be a recurrent pattern characteristic of this type of a learning project. However, equally significant is the consequence of a two-day group dynamics session intended to explore the non-rational components of learning. Although the session did not achieve full payoff in the fifth week of the Fall institute, fuller experience brought greater success in subsequent institutes.

The list of lecture topics revealed that the program concentrated most on immediate work issues most familiar to the participants in weeks three and five; whereas weeks one, two, and four focused on the implications of the behavior sciences. Therefore, the results summarized above reflect the resistance a teacher encounters when the course centers on matters least familiar to his students. It would be an error to assume that student evaluation is a completely accurate barometer of the significance of classroom experiences. The ultimate measurement of the institutes' effectiveness

is to be found in the contribution each participant will make upon return to his prison system. Since such learning is integrated within the student's personality, it is extremely difficult to isolate the contribution of specific experiences at Southern Illinois University.

Attitudes Toward Punishment

The selecting process tended to favor individuals whose work experience had involved them in a custodial function. In light of this, there was interest in measuring the degree of attitude change. Because of the homogeneity of student characteristics, plus wide differences in penal progress among the prisons from which the participants were drawn, the staff had little optimism concerning the likelihood that reliable results could be obtained in measuring attitude change in the course of only a few weeks. Furthermore, the relatively small number of institute participants undermines reliability of conclusions. However, the project was undertaken as a secondary effort.

A questionnaire, first developed by Thurstone, was administered. The instrument was intended to measure the degree of attitude change along a continuum from "punitiveness" to"rehabilitation". We conceptualize "rehabilitation" to

be an approximation of understanding about the more profound aspects of a program to modify the values and attitudes of convicted offenders. "Punitiveness" suggests an unsophisticated faith that application of coercive strategies, in and of themselves, will effect desired change in human beings. The instrument consists of 34 items, each of which is a statement with which the subject agrees or disagrees. The score is the median of the scale values of all those items with which he agrees. For group scores, we employed an average of those medians. The lowest scale value (0.0) constitutes agreement with the statement: "Even the most vicious criminal should not be harmed. The highest scale value (10.6) is attached to: "only by extreme brutal punishment can we cure the criminal."

Our first hypothesis: Training Officers (our students) as well as correctional officers (students of our students) were more punitive before they participated in the L.E.A. Institute than after they had participated.

As Table 2 demonstrates, only the Winter institute demonstrated a change in attitude away from "punitiveness" and toward a "rehabilitation" orientation. However, because of the small sample, the difference was not significant statistically.

TABLE 2: ATTITUDE TOWARD PUNISHMENT OF CRIMINALS: MEAN SCORES, FOR FOUR KINDS OF SUBJECTS. FALL 1967, WINTER AND SPRING 1968[1]

	Mean Score		Before - After	
Group Tested	Before	After	Significance	Test(s) used
Fall 1967				
Training Officers	4.33	4.14	N.S: $.35 < p < .40$	Chi square on Median Test
Correctional Officers	4.82	----	----	
Winter 1968				
Training Officers	4.43	4.02	$p < .025$	Chi square, corrected for continuity, on Median Test
Correctional Officers	5.01	3.92	$p < .05$	Chi square on Median Test
Spring 1968				
Training Officers	3.80	3.95	N.S.	Median Test[2]
Correctional Officers	4.60	4.55	N.S.	Median Test[2]

[1]Higher scores correspond to attitudes more favorable to punishment.

[2]According to the median test, there was no change whatever between pre- and post-test in either participant group in the Spring 1968 Institute.

Our conclusion is that the hypothesis is not supported. The conclusion is reasonable because the participants demonstrated a degree of orientation toward rehabilitation-orientation when they entered the institute. Mean pre-test scores of training officers ranged from 3.33 to 3.80, thereby jeopardizing possibility of significant changes in scores. Furthermore, we can not be certain that the testing of "punitiveness" was not associated by participants with the idea of being subjected to ideological rehabilitation as students. Probably, under these circumstances, the items did not capture the shadings of meanings which differentiate treatment-oriented staff found among custodians from the custodians who have a simple faith in punishment per se. It may be that the learning experiences tended to undermine the capacity of students to make choices in general statements. In a time of intellectual change, university students frequently find true-false examination questions particularly difficult to answer because they see issues not intended by the framer of the questions. In this way, the institute participants may have been unable to make choices while undergoing education experiences in an unfamiliar setting.

Our second hypothesis: Correctional officers were more punitive than training officers.

We conclude that correctional officers are more in favor of punishment than training officers. For the Winter institute, there is a reversal of the direction between the two groups. For the difference in the pre-test is $p>0.2$; for the post-test $p>0.2$ also (both two-tailed). Since more direction was predicted, however, use of the one-tailed test in the later gives $0.85<p<0.90$. The difference in the Spring institute is significant at the 0.01 level of confidence (median test with chi-square, two-tailed). The mean score for the training officer advances and that of the correctional officers declines. Therefore, the difference between them decreases when pre-test and post-tests are compared.

However, recalling the cautions stated at the beginning of this section, the conclusions should not be applied to correctional personnel in general. Our students were recruited from correctional systems willing to participate in this particular training project and which selected participants on the basis of varying specific criteria. Therefore, conditions for sampling of correctional personnel generally are not met.

APPENDIX
I.

PROJECT STAFF: RESIDENT AND VISITING

Instructional Staff: Resident and Visiting

James E. Adams, Administrative Assistant, Law Enforcement Assistance Program, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Dale Anderson, Staff Member, Group Dynamics Program, Vermont State Hospital, Waterbury, Vermont.

Mary Ellen Barry, Intern, Group Dynamics Program, Vermont State Hospital, Waterbury, Vermont.

Michael Becker, Research Assistant.

Edward Bencini, Research Assistant.

Donald Benson, Research Assistant, Department of Design.

John Brady, Research Assistant.

Ronald Braithwaite, Research Assistant.

Stanley L. Brodsky, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Robert J. Brooks, Lecturer and Project Director, Law Enforcement Assistance Program, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Henry Burns, Jr., Instructor, Law Enforcement Assistance Program, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Larry Culp, Research Assistant.

William Deane, Research Sociologist Group Dynamics Program, Vermont State Hospital, Waterbury, Vermont.

Harry Denzel, Instructor, Department of Guidance and Educational Psychology, Southern Illinois University.

Robert Dreher, Assistant Professor in Government, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Ronald Gaugenti, Research Assistant.

O. W. "Sonny" Goldenstein, Research Assistant.

Jordan Goldstein, Research Assistant.

John E. Grenfell, Associate Professor of Guidance, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Harold Grosowsky, Co-chairman, Department of Design, Southern Illinois University.

Julius Henry, Staff Assistant, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Arnold Hopkins, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

Virginia Horak, Research Assistant.

Vernon Jeffries, Research Assistant.

Elmer H. Johnson, Professor of Sociology and Assistant Director of the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Linda Kammler, Research Assistant.

George Kiefer, Project Director, Illinois In-Service Training Program for Correctional Personnel, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Ronald Knowlton, Assistant Professor, Men's Physical Education, Southern Illinois University.

Thomas Korff, Research Assistant.

Conrad Krauft, Research Assistant.

Robert Kustra, Research Assistant.

Allan Lammers, Research Assistant.

Gwen Lofquist, Research Assistant.

Dale Lytton, Research Assistant.

Charles V. Matthews, Associate Professor of Education and Director of the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Fred J. Mayo, Student, Southern Illinois University.

Thomas McDonald, Research Assistant.

Duncan Mitchell, Coordinator, Instructional Materials, Law Enforcement Assistance Program, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Douglas Mougey, Research Assistant.

James E. Nugent, Research Assistant.

John O'Neill, Investigator, Jackson County Legal Aid Program, Carbondale, Illinois.

Shirlee Owens, Research Assistant.

Richard C. Pooley, Staff Assistant, Law Enforcement Assistance Program, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Arthur E. Prell, Professor of Marketing and Director, Business Research Bureau, Southern Illinois University.

Edward Quiko, Research Assistant.

Royce Ragland, Research Assistant.

Michael Rainey, Research Assistant.

Richard Rasche, Research Assistant.

Peter Rompler, Operations Analyst, Law Enforcement Assistance Program, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

James Russell, Research Assistant.

Fleary D. Samples, Instructor, Law Enforcement Assistance Program, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Robert Sigler, Research Assistant.

Robert Spackman, Athletic Trainer, Men's Physical Education, Southern Illinois University.

James W. Tippy, Research Assistant.

John Twomey, Assistant Professor, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University.

Ronald W. Vander Wiel, Associate Professor, School of Social Service, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Richard Vandiver, Research Assistant.

William Vollmer, Research Assistant.

Herbert Weber, Assistant Professor, Men's Physical Education, Southern Illinois University.

Robert L. White, Assistant Program Director, Learning Resources Service, Southern Illinois University.

Robert Whitler, Research Assistant.

Richard Wilhelmy, Consultant in Law Enforcement Administration, Carbondale, Illinois.

Frank Wilkerson, Director of Treatment, Detroit House of Corrections, Plymouth, Michigan.

Vergil Williams, Research Assistant.

Beverly Wilson, Learning Center Faculty, Carbondale Community High School, East.

Greg Witkowski, Research Assistant.

APPENDIX
II.

PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE FOR 1st INSTITUTE
OCTOBER 2 - NOVEMBER 22, 1967

TRAINING OFFICERS
OCTOBER 2 - NOVEMBER 22, 1967

David Miller Benson
Walden Correctional Institution
4500 Broad River Road
P.O. Box 766
Columbia, South Carolina 29210

James G. Blodgett
Montana State Prison
Box 7
Deer Lodge, Montana 59722

Richard J. Christiansen
Michigan Reformatory
Ionia, Michigan 48846

William E. Collins
Indiana State Prison
P.O. Box 41
Michigan City Indiana 46360

John W. Geary
New Hampshire State Prison
Box 14
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Willie J. Griner
Georgia State Prison
Reidsville, Georgia 30453

Russell F. Hayward
Connecticut State Prison
P.O. Box 100
Somers, Connecticut 060701

Cornelius D. Hogan
Division of Correction and Parole
135 West Hanover Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Claude L. Massey, Jr.
1100 Laurel Avenue
Seaford, Delaware

Warren McCarron
Vermont State Prison & House of
Correction for Men
65 State Street
Windsor, Vermont 05089

William V. McCracken
Central Office
Ohio Division of Correction
1211 State Office Building
Columbus, Ohio 43215

John W. McLimans
Wisconsin State Reformatory
Box WR
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54305

Evelyn Ramsdell
Connecticut State Farm & Prison
For Women
Box 456
Niantic, Connecticut 06357

Russell R. Rogers
South Dakota State Penitentiary
Box 911
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57101

James L. Van Ryzin
Alabama State Board of Corrections
Route 3
Box 115
Montgomery, Alabama 36110

TRAINING OFFICERS--OCTOBER 2 - NOVEMBER 22, 1967
Page 2

George J. Burke
Department of Correction
Training Academy
South Bridgewater, Massachusetts 02324

Ronald P. Bolduc
Maine State Prison
Box A
Thomaston, Maine 04861

James B. Stockslager
Maryland Correctional Institution
Route #3
Hagerstown, Maryland 21740

William K. Valko
Division of Correction
1800 Washington Street, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Harold L. Williams
Central Correctional Institution
1515 Gist Street
P.O. Box 766
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

William G. Woodward
Wyoming State Penitentiary
Box 400
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

FALL
Staff Training Officers Institute
October 2 - November 22, 1967

WEEK ONE

Monday, October 2, 1967

9	AM	Introduction - Orientation	Robert J. Brooks
1:30	PM	Testing Session and Campus Tour	James E. Adams
6:30	PM	Film: The Criminal	Henry Burns, Jr. Robert Sigler

Tuesday, October 3, 1967

9	AM	Personality Development and Adjustment	Stanley L. Brodsky
1:30	PM	Laboratory	

Wednesday, October 4, 1967

9	AM	Crime in America	Elmer H. Johnson
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: The Ethnological Criminal	Fleary D. Samples

Thursday, October 5, 1967

9	AM	The Offender	Elmer H. Johnson
1:30	PM	Laboratory	

Friday, October 6, 1967

9	AM	Psychosocial Aspects and Corrections	John Twomey
1:30	PM	Laboratory	

Saturday, October 7, 1967

9	AM	The Correctional Process	Robert J. Brooks

WEEK TWO

Monday, October 9, 1967			
9	AM	The Structure of Institutions	Elmer H. Johnson
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Films: Left Hands, Red Hair, and Crime	
		The Prison Community	Elmer H. Johnson
Tuesday, October 10, 1967			
9	AM	The Social Deviant and Society	Charles V. Matthews
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Wednesday, October 11, 1967			
9	AM	Non-Institutional Treatment	Henry Burns, Jr.
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: Culture and Crime	Vernon Jeffries
Thursday, October 12, 1967			
9	AM	Recent Court Decisions and Corrections	Robert H. Dreher
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Friday, October 13, 1967			
9	AM	United States Penitentiary, Marion, Illinois Institutional Analysis Conduct of Tours	Henry Burns, Jr.
Saturday, October 14, 1967			
9	AM	Maintaining Physical Fitness	Herbert Weber Ronald G. Knowlton

WEEK THREE

Monday, October 16, 1967			
9	AM	Communication Styles	John E. Grenfell
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Films: I.Q. and Crime Dehumanization and the Total Institution	John Brady
Tuesday, October 17, 1967			
9	AM	Introducing Change into a Correctional Setting	Arthur E. Prell
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Wednesday, October 18, 1967			
9	AM	The Creative Process	Harold Grosowsky
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Thursday, October 19, 1967			
9	AM	Problem Solving	Duncan Mitchell
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	TV Film: The Defiant Ones	Robert J. Brooks Allan Lammers
Friday, October 20, 1967			
9	AM	Programmed Instruction	Harry Denzel
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Saturday, October 21, 1967			
		Unscheduled	

WEEK FOUR

Monday, October 23, 1967		
9 AM	Innovative Correctional Programs	Arnold Hopkins
1:30 PM	Laboratory	
6:30 PM	Film: The Quiet One	Robert H. Dreher Royce Ragland
Tuesday, October 24, 1967		
9 AM	Correctional Research	Stanley Brodsky Elmer H. Johnson Royce Ragland
1:30 PM	Laboratory	
6:30 PM	35mm Slide Presentation: Case II	James Nugent
Wednesday, October 25, 1967		
9 AM	Basic Statistical Tools	John Brady Tom Korff
1:30 PM	Laboratory	
6:30 PM	Films: Crime Under 21 Boy with a Knife	
Thursday, October 26, 1967		
9 AM	Measuring Trainee Progress	Stanley Brodsky
1:30 PM	Laboratory	
Friday, October 27, 1967		
9 AM	Inmate Perspectives	John O'Neil
1:30 PM	Laboratory	
Saturday, October 28, 1967		
8 AM	Group Dynamics Session This program will continue Throughout day and evening	William Deane Dale Anderson Mary Ellen Barry
Sunday, October 29, 1967		
12:00 Noon	Group Dynamics: Analysis	William Deane Dale Anderson Mary Ellen Barry

WEEK FIVE

Monday, October 30, 1967			
9	AM	Class Values and Behavior	Ronald Vander Wiel
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: The Roots of Criminality	Henry Burns, Jr. Virgil Williams
Tuesday, October 31, 1967			
9	AM	A New Look at Custody	Frank Wilkerson
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Wednesday, November 1, 1967			
9	AM	Administrative Structures	Henry Burns, Jr.
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Thursday, November 2, 1967			
9	AM	The Correctional Officer Role	Robert J. Brooks
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	35mm Slide Presentation: The Background of Corrections	Allan Lammers
Friday, November 3, 1967			
9	AM	Laboratory	
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Saturday, November 4, 1967			
		Unscheduled	

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS
NOVEMBER 6-17, 1967

Richard Lee Bracey
Michigan Reformatory
Ionia, Michigan 48846

James G. Clark
Indiana Youth Center
P.O. Box 314
Plainfield, Indiana 46168

Joe P. Class
South Dakota Penitentiary
Box 911
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57101

K. Cope
West Virginia Penitentiary
Moundsville, West Virginia 26041

H. Cox
West Virginia Medium Security Prison
Huttonsville, West Virginia 26237

Archie G. Craft
Central Correctional Institution
1515 Gist Street
P.O. Box 540
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Jerry Wayne Decker
Indiana State Reformatory
P.O. Box 28
Pendleton, Indiana 46064

James F. Digman
Atmore Prison
Route 2, Box 38
Atmore, Alabama 36502

Jimmy Lee Drenning
Wateree River Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 12
Boykin, South Carolina 29019

Michael Duling
Vermont State Prison & House of Correction
65 State Street
Windsor, Vermont 05089

Raymond N. Ernster
South Dakota Penitentiary
Box 911
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57101

Harold Haupt
Wisconsin Correctional Camp System
P.O. Box 669
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

Lyle G. Hendrick
Manning Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 3173
Columbia, South Carolina 29203

Robert Lieske
Wisconsin Correctional Institution
Fox Lake, Wisconsin 53933

James A. Mac Cormick
Maine State Prison
Box A
Thomaston, Maine 04861

Robert Magoon
New Hampshire State Prison
Box 14
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Horace Lee McKinnon
Draper Correctional Center
Elmore, Alabama 36025

Donald W. Martinell
South Dakota Penitentiary
Box 911
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57101

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS
NOVEMBER 6-17, 1967
Page 2

Robert Phillips
New Jersey State Prison
Third Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08606

Bernard R. Rocheleau
Connecticut State Prison
Box 100
Somer, Connecticut 06071

John W. Shifler
Maryland Correctional Institution
Route 3
Hagerstown, Maryland 21740

Marjorie Sheffield
New Jersey Reformatory for Women
Clinton, New Jersey 08809

Lt. Paul Silva
Vermont State Prison and House of Correction
65 State Street
Windsor, Vermont 05089

William D. Smith
Indiana State Prison
P.O. Box 41
Michigan City, Indiana 46360

C. Sowards
West Virginia Penitentiary
Moundsville, West Virginia 26041

Calvin K. Stanton
Michigan Reformatory
Ionia, Michigan 48846

Virgil Kenneth Swartz
Wyoming State Penitentiary
Rawlins, Wyoming 83201

Raymond L. Taylor
Maryland Correctional Institution
Route 3
Hagerstown, Maryland 21740

Kenneth N. Vanderbosch
State Prison of Southern Michigan
4000 Cooper Street
Jackson, Michigan 49201

Agnes Wade
Connecticut State Farm and Prison for Women
Box 456
Niantic, Connecticut 06357

Bennie G. Weldon
Kilby Prison
Route 3, Box 115
Montgomery, Alabama 36110

Gerald R. Wetzler
Montana State Prison
Box 7
Deer Lodge, Montana 59601

Paul L. Willard
Maryland Correctional Institution
Route 3
Hagerstown, Maryland 21740

2

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS INSTITUTE
THE PRACTICE TEACHING EXPERIENCE

WEEK SIX

Lesson Topic	Time
Monday, November 6, 1967	
Introduction	9 AM
Tests	10 AM
Business Matters	11 AM
Objectives of In-Service Training	1:30 PM
Development of the Penal Institution - Early	2:30 PM
Tuesday, November 7, 1967	
Development of the Penal Institution - Modern	9 AM
Your Job, The Correctional Process and the Criminal Justice System	10 AM
Communications and Administrative Structure	11 AM
General Responsibilities of a Correctional Officer	1:30 PM
The Prison Community: Organization	2:30 PM
Wednesday, November 8, 1967	
The Prison Community: Roles	9 AM
The Inmate: Cultural Differences	10 AM
Inmate Admission and Orientation	11 AM
The Inmate: Individual Differences	1:30 PM
The Correctional Officer and Classification - Reclassification	2:30 PM

Lesson Topic	Time
Thursday, Nobember 9, 1967	
Custody and Supervision Levels - Max., Med., Min.	9 AM
Pictorial Survey of Institutional Security Features	10 AM
Key and Tool Control	11 AM
Bill Sands	1 PM
Sands' Discussion	2:30 PM
Friday, November 10, 1967	
Contraband Control	9 AM
Counts, Shakedowns, Cell Searches	10 AM
First Aid I	11 AM
First Aid II	1:30 PM
Self-Defense	2:30 PM

WEEK SEVEN

Lesson Topic	Time
Monday, November 13, 1967	
Use and Handling of Firearms and Gas	9 AM
Disturbance Prevention and Control I	10 AM
Disturbance Prevention and Control II	11 AM
Emergency Measures	1:30 PM
A. Escapes	
B. Fire	
C. Natural Disasters	
The Transportation of Prisoners	2:30 PM
Tuesday, November 14, 1967	
Discipline in the Correctional Institution	9 AM
Report Writing I	10 AM
Report Writing II	11 AM
The Employment of Inmates	1:30 PM
The Leisure Hours of Inmates	2:30 PM
Wednesday, November 15, 1967	
The Correctional Officer and the Education Program	9 AM
The Correctional Officer and Counseling-Casework Services	10 AM
The Correctional Officer and Institutional Medical Services	11 AM
Visits and Correspondence	1:30 PM
Avocations and the Inmate	2:30 PM

Lesson Topic	Time
Thursday, November 16, 1967	
Personal Physical and Mental Fitness of the Correctional Officer	9 AM
Inmate Community Assistance Programs	10 AM
The Correctional Officer and Inmate Preparation for Release	11 AM
System and Community Services for the Releasee	1:30 PM
The Use of Volunteers in the Correctional Process	2:30 PM
Friday, November 17, 1967	
The Correctional Officer and Public Relations	9 AM
What Are We Doing?	10 AM
Growth Through Training	11 AM
Tests	1:30 PM
Presentation of Certificates	2:30 PM

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS
NOVEMBER 18-22, 1967

Mr. Frederick E. Adams
Assistant Warden
Connecticut State Prison
Box 100
Somers, Connecticut 06071

Mr. James J. Boorman
Associate Warden--Security
Wisconsin Correctional Institution
Box 147
Fox Lake, Wisconsin 53933

Mr. Joseph G. Cannon
Commissioner of Correction
State Department of Correction
920-22 Greenmount Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Mr. Edward L. Colbert
Warden
Michigan Reformatory
Ionia, Michigan 48846

Mrs. Elizabeth W. Crouch
Assistant Superintendent
Connecticut State Farm & Prison
For Women
Box 456
Niantic, Connecticut 06357

Mr. H.T. Eldridge
Supervisor of Training
S.C. Department of Corrections
1515 Gist Street
P.O. Box 766
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Mr. Jerome Henry
Superintendent
Indiana Reformatory
Box 28
Pendleton, Indiana 46064

Mr. Clifford Hoff
Assistant Deputy Warden
South Dakota Penitentiary
Box 911
Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57101

Mr. Kenneth A. Jacobson
Assistant Deputy Warden
Maine State Prison
Box A
Thomaston, Maine 04861

Mr. William D. Leeke, Warden
Central Correctional Institution
1515 Gist Street
P.O. Box 766
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Mr. W.S. Nix, Superintendent
Georgia Training and Development
Center
Buford, Georgia 30518

Mr. Frank J. Nuzum, Deputy Director
Division of Correction
1800 Washington Street, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Mr. Robert G. Smith, Warden
Vermont State Prison & House of
Correction for Men
65 State Street
Windsor, Vermont 05089

Lieutenant John Svarney
Montana State Prison
Box 7
Deer Lodge, Montana 59601

Mr. Harry W. Towers
Director of Institutions
Department of Corrections
R.D. No. 1, Box 246-A
Smyrna, Delaware 19977

Mr. Howard Yeager
Principal Keeper
New Jersey State Prison
Third Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08606

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS INSTITUTE

WEEK EIGHT

Friday, November 17, 1967

Arrival at Center and housing arrangements.

Saturday, November 18, 1967

9	AM	Welcome - Introduction to the Institute	Center Faculty
11	AM	Sample Presentation I (This session begins a series of presentations by training officer participants of the eight-week Institute. A variety of training topics will be used).	Institute Participant
1:30	PM	Sample Presentation II	Institute Participant
5	PM	Administrators Reception	

Sunday, November 19, 1967

1	PM	The Organization of In-Service Training Programs	Robert J. Brooks
3	PM	The Evaluation of Training	Peter O. Rompler
7	PM	Selected Films	Robert Sigler

Monday, November 20, 1967

9	AM	The Institution in Review	Fleary D. Samples Institute Participants
1	PM	Sample Presentation III	Institute Participant
2	PM	Interpreting Crime Statistics	Elmer H. Johnson

Tuesday, November 21, 1967

9	AM	Sample Presentation IV	Institute Participant
10:30	AM	Tools for Trainers	Duncan E. Mitchell Robert J. Brooks
1:30	PM	Joint Planning of Training: Implementation of Administrative Policy	Henry Burns, Jr.
6:15	PM	Social Hour	
7	PM	Banquet - Holiday INN Presentation of Certificates	Charles V. Matthews

Wednesday, November 22, 1967

8:30 AM Planning Report — Henry Burns, Jr.

This morning's session will conclude in time for participants to leave on the mid-day plane at 12:41 PM.

APPENDIX
III.

PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE FOR 2nd INSTITUTE
JANUARY 8 - MARCH 1, 1968

TRAINING OFFICERS
JANUARY 8 - MARCH 1, 1968

W.R. Abbott, Jr.
Montana State Prison
Box 7
Deer Lodge, Montana 59722

Robert L. Autry
Florida State Prison
P.O. Box 221
Raiford, Florida 32083

Lt. Phillip Dwyer
Youth Reception and Correction Center
Yardville, New Jersey 08620

Mrs. Yoland B. Evans
Tennessee Prison for Women
Stewarts Lane
Nashville, Tennessee 37218

George C. Griffin
Connecticut Dept. of Adult Probation
7 Grand Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06105

Eugene C. Hardman
Virginia Penitentiary
500 Spring Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Malcolm Lee Hill
Sumter Correctional Institution
Box 667
Bushnell, Florida 33513

J.J. Keech
Department of Correctional Services
920 Greenmount Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Walter Paul McNeal
Georgia Industrial Institute
Alto, Georgia 30510

Alfonso Mikelonis
State Prison of Southern Michigan
4000 Cooper Street
Jackson, Michigan 49201

Richard Kevin O'Donnell
Beacon State Institution
Box 307
Beacon, New York 12508

Leftwich Reynolds
Virginia Division of Corrections
Training Center
Camp #13
Chesterfield, Virginia 23832

Samuel W. Smith
Utah State Prison
Box 250
Draper, Utah 84020

William Wallace Staunton, Jr.
Department of Social Services
Corrections Division
Hawaii State Prison
2109 Kamehameha Highway
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

J. Keith Stell
Division of Youth And Adult
Pouch "H"
Health & Welfare Building
Juneau, Alaska 99801

John S. York
Manning Correctional Institution
Box 3173
Columbia, South Carolina 29203

WINTER
Staff Training Officers Institute
January 8 - March 1, 1968

WEEK ONE
Differences That Make a Difference

Monday, January 8, 1968

9	AM	Introduction - Orientation	Robert J. Brooks
1:30	PM	Campus Tour	
6:30	PM	Film: Crime in the Cities	Vernon Jeffries

Tuesday, January 9, 1968

9	AM	Class Values and Behavior	Ronald W. Vanderwiel
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Films: To Be Announced	Peter Rompler

Wednesday, January 10, 1968

9	AM	Poverty and Justice	Robert Dreher
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: Criminal Justice in the United States	Allan Lammers

Thursday, January 11, 1968

9	AM	Cultural Factors	Peter Rompler
1:30	PM	Laboratory	

Friday, January 12, 1968

9	AM	Group Dynamics	John E. Grenfell
1:30	PM	Group Dynamics	

Saturday, January 13, 1968

9	AM	Group Dynamics	John E. Grenfell

WEEK TWO
The Prison Community

Monday, January 15, 1968			
9	AM	Prison Community - Organization	Elmer H. Johnson
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Tuesday, January 16, 1968			
9	AM	Prison Community - Roles	Elmer H. Johnson
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Wednesday, January 17, 1968			
9	AM	Inmate Perspectives	John O'Neil Fred Mayo
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Discussion: How to be a Better Criminal	Stanley Brodsky
Thursday, January 18, 1968			
9	AM	A New Look at Custody	Frank Wilkerson
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: To Be Announced	Richard Pooley
Friday, January 19, 1968			
9	AM	Role of the Correctional Officer	Robert J. Brooks
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Saturday, January 20, 1968			
9	AM	Unscheduled	

WEEK THREE
Corrections and Society

Monday, January 22, 1968			
9	AM	Legal Basis of Corrections	Robert Dreher
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: Dehumanization and the Total Institution	
Tuesday, January 23, 1968			
9	AM	The Correctional Process	Robert J. Brooks
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Wednesday, January 24, 1968			
9	AM	Institutional Programs	Henry Burns, Jr.
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: To Be Announced	Robert Sigler
Thursday, January 25, 1968			
9	AM	Non-Institutional Programs	Henry Burns, Jr.
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Friday, January 26, 1968			
9	AM	Counseling Programs - A Bridge to Society	Sam Samples
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: The Doomed and Discussion of Capitol Punishment	Henry Burns, Jr. Royce Ragland
Saturday, January 27, 1968			
9	AM	Organizing for Training	Robert J. Brooks

WEEK FOUR
Corrections and Change

Monday, January 29, 1968			
9	AM	Introducing Change into the Correctional Setting	Arthur Prell
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: The Quiet One	Robert H. Dreher Ronald Braithwaite
Tuesday, January 30, 1968			
9	AM	Creative Thinking	Harold Grosowsky
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Film: Twelve Angry Men	Harold Grosowsky
Wednesday, January 31, 1968			
9	AM	Problem Solving	Duncan Mitchell
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
6:30	PM	Discussion: A Crimeless Society	Don Benson
Thursday, February 1, 1968			
9	AM	Research and Change	Stanley Brodsky Royce Ragland Elmer H. Johnson
Friday, February 2, 1968			
		RECESS	
Saturday, February 3, 1968			
		RECESS	

WEEK FIVE
Resources for Training

Monday, February 5, 1968			
9	AM	The Learning Resources Center	Beverly Wilson
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Tuesday, February 6, 1968			
9	AM	Institutional Analysis	Henry Burns, Jr.
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Wednesday, February 7, 1968			
9	AM	Maintaining Physical Fitness	Herbert Weber
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Thursday, February 8, 1968			
9	AM	Measuring Trainee Progress	Peter Rompler
1:30	PM	Laboratory	
Friday, February 9, 1968			
9	AM	People, Environments, and Communications	John F. Twomey
1:30	PM	Laboratory	

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS
FEBRUARY 12-23, 1968

Wallace L. Atkinson
Montana State Prison
Box 7
Deer Lodge, Montana 59722

Thomas J. Burnham, Jr.
Sumter Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 667
Bushness, Florida 33513

Charles M. Davenport
Maryland House of Correction
Box 534
Jessup, Maryland 20794

Sherry E. Dobbs
Sing Sing Prison
Ossining, New York 10562

J.C. Dodgen
Meriwether Prison Branch
Warm Springs, Georgia 31830

Lawson A. Hardge
Department of Correction
Tennessee State Penitentiary
Centennial Blvd.
Nashville, Tennessee 37209

Henry W. Harris
Florida State Prison
P.O. Box 238
Starke, Florida 32091

Roger Hephner
State Prison Southern Michigan
4000 Cooper Street
Jackson, Michigan 49201

Virgil Lee
Florida State Prison
P.O. Box 238
Starke, Florida 32091

J.M. Massengale
Georgia Industrial Institute
Alto, Georgia 30510

Charles G. Moses
Anchorage State Jail
Box 233
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

William Siegmund
Vermont State Prison & House
of Correction for Men
65 State Street
Windsor, Vermont 05089

Richard W. Singletary
Maryland House of Correction
Box 534
Jessup, Maryland 20794

Jerome Toomey
Vermont State Prison and House
of Correction for Men
65 State Street
Windsor, Vermont 05089

Richard Walmsley
Florida State Prison
P.O. Box 238
Starke, Florida 32091

Donald Allan Wescott
Maryland House of Correction
Box 534
Jessup, Maryland 20794

Sammy Lee Wilson
Indiana Reformatory
Box 28
Pendleton, Indiana 46064

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS
FEBRUARY 12-23, 1968
Page 2

Rufus Baker
Virginia State Penitentiary
500 Spring Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Marshall T. Ellison
Bland Correctional Farm
Route 2
Bland, Virginia 24315

Miss Edith McKelvey
State Home for Girls
P.O. Box 233
Trenton, New Jersey 08602

George A. Phipps
Indiana State Prison
P.O. Box 41
Michigan City, Indiana 46360

James Rouse
Youth Reception & Correction
Center
Yardville, New Jersey 08620

Johnny L. Yarbrough
State Prison of Southern Michigan
4000 Cooper Street
Jackson, Michigan 49201

R.A. Young
State Road Camp #30
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

David George Sanford
State Prison of Southern Michigan
4000 Cooper Street
Jackson, Michigan 49201

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS INSTITUTE
THE PRACTICE TEACHING EXPERIENCE

WEEK SIX

Lesson Topic	Instructor	Time
Monday, February 12, 1968		
Introduction to the Institutes		9 AM - 12
Inmate Behavioral Control	Mr. Hill	1 PM
Function of Reception and Diagnostic Center	Mr. Hardman	2 PM
Development of Penal Institutions after 1870	Mr. Malone	3 PM
The Correctional Process	Mr. Stell	4 PM
Demonstration: Student Self Response Room 121	Lawson Hall	7:30 PM
Tuesday, February 13, 1968		
Work and School Release	Mr. O'Donnell	9 AM
Transportation of Inmates	Mr. Weldon	10 AM
Escape Plan	Mr. Keech	11 AM
Role Playing	Mr. Hill	1 PM
Role of Probation and Parole Officers as related to Institution and Community	Mr. Malone	2 PM
Correctional Ethics	Mr. Hardman	3 PM
Social Services	Mr. Stell	4 PM
Discussion: "Conference Leadership"	Mr. Burns & Miss Ragland	6:30 PM
Wednesday, February 14, 1968		
Search and Shakedown	Mr. O'Donnell	9 AM
First Aid	Mr. Weldon	10 AM
Legal Rights of Inmates	Mr. Keech	11 AM
Personal Mental and Physical Fitness	Mr. Hill	1 PM
Role Playing - Social Worker and Correctional Officer	Mr. Malone	2 PM
History of Probation and Parole	Mr. Hardman	3 PM
Segregation and Its Alternatives	Mr. Stell	4 PM

Lesson Topic	Instructor	Time
Thursday, February 15, 1968		
Techniques of Supervising of Inmates	Mr. O'Donnell	9 AM
Riot Control	Mr. Keech	10 AM
Tool and Key Control	Mr. Weldon	11 AM
Admission and Orientation	Mrs. Evans	1 PM
Objectives and Duties of the Correctional Officer	Mr. York	2 PM
Gas and Weapons Control and Use	Mr. Mikelonis	3 PM
Discussion: "New Tools, Old Problems"	Mr. Mitchell	6:30 PM
Friday, February 16, 1968		
Objectives of In-Service Training	Mrs. Evans	9 AM
Educational and Vocational Programming	Mr. Mikelonis	10 AM
Recreation and Leisure Time Activities	Mr. Staunton	11 AM
The Analysis of Human Behavior	Mr. Abbott	1 PM
Inmate Culture	Mr. Staunton	2 PM
Effects of Imprisonment	Mr. Abbott	3 PM

WEEK SEVEN

Lesson Topic	Instructor	Time
Monday, February 19, 1968		
Pre-Release	Mrs. Evans	9 AM
Food, Clothing, and Medical Services	Mr. York	10 AM
Disciplinary Committee	Mr. Abbott	11 AM
Public Relations	Mr. York	1 PM
Community Resources	Mr. Mikelonis	2 PM
Volunteer Groups	Mr. Staunton	3 PM
Discussion - Demonstration: "Psychological Tests"	Mr. Brooks	6:30 PM
Tuesday, February 20, 1968		
Development of Penal Institutions - prior to 1870	Mr. Griffin	1 PM
Social Class and Values	Mr. Dwyer	2 PM
The Use of Training Aids	Mr. Smith	3 PM
Verbal Communications	Mr. Griffin	4 PM
Wednesday, February 21, 1968		
Written Communication	Mr. McNeil	9 AM
Counts as they Relate to the Institutional Security	Mr. Mattmiller	10 AM
Role Playing--Correctional Officer & Inmate	Mr. Reynolds	11 AM
Types of Inmates	Mr. Dwyer	1 PM
Classification and Reclassification	Mr. Autry	2 PM
Correctional Officer as a Counselor	Mr. McNeil	3 PM
Self-Defense	Mr. Reynolds	4 PM
Film: The Odds Against	Mr. Sigler	6:30 PM

Lesson Topic	Instructor	Time
Thursday, February 22, 1968		
Contraband	Mr. Mattmiller	9 AM
The Inmate Economic System	Mr. Smith	10 AM
Role Playing--Probation and Parole Officer and Parolee	Mr. Griffin	11 AM
Institutional Industrial Programs	Mr. Autry	1 PM
Role Playing--Correctional Officer and Academic and Vocational Staff	Mr. Dwyer	2 PM
Visit and Mailing Privileges	Mr. McNeil	3 PM
Institutional Management	Mr. Smith	4 PM
Friday, February 23, 1968		
Prevention of Riots	Mr. Autry	9 AM
Modern Trends in Corrections	Mr. Mattmiller	10 AM
Role Playing--The Correctional Officer and the Warden	Mr. Reynolds	11 AM

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS
FEBRUARY 26 - MARCH 1, 1968

James A. Ball, III
Division of Corrections Central Office
301 Farris Bryant Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Alfred R. Bennett
Indiana Youth Rehabilitation Camps
Box 323
Plainfield, Indiana 46168

Thomas R. Branton
Acting Director
Youth & Corrections Agency
Pouch "H"
Juneau, Alaska 99801

E.B. Caldwell
Georgia Industrial Institute
Alto, Georgia 30510

Earnest O. Carlton
Florida State Prison
P.O. Box 238
Starke, Florida 32091

Preston L. Fitzberger
Maryland Correctional Institution
Hagerstown, Maryland 21740

David R. Harris
Main Office
N.Y. State Dept. of Correction
Albany, New York 12225

H.P. Jackson
Assistant Superintendent
State Farm
State Farm, Virginia 23166

Bobby J. Leverett
Manning Correctional Institution
Box 3173
Columbia, South Carolina 29203

Mrs. Martha K. Linder
Tennessee State Prison for Women
Nashville, Tennessee 37218

Bobby Miles
Montana State Prison
Box 7
Deer Lodge, Montana 59722

Ira Mintz, Ph.D.
Reformatory for Males
Bordentown, New Jersey 08505

James M. Panopoulos
Central Office
Maryland Department of Correction
920 Greenmount Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

John W. Turner
Utah State Prison
Box 250
Draper, Utah 84020

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS INSTITUTE
WEEK EIGHT

Monday, February 26, 1968

9 AM	Welcome Introduction to the Institute	Charles V. Matthews, Center Director
	The Joint Commission: Implications for Correctional Administrators	William T. Adams, Associate Director Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower & Training
1:30 PM	"Raising Anxiety Levels as Tools for Training"	C.R. Dodge, Employee Training Specialist Colorado Youth Services Denver, Colorado
6:30 PM	"Needs and Realities in Correctional Training"--A Conference Telelecture	Charles V. Matthews, Moderator Participants: E. Preston Sharp, General Secretary American Correctional Association Washington, D.C. Benjamin Frank, Task Force Director Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training Washington, D.C. Cornelius D. Hogan, Division of Corrections and Parole Department of Institutions and Agencies Trenton, New Jersey

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

9 AM	"Interpersonal Factors in the Training Process"	John E. Grenfell, Associate Professor Center
1:30 PM	"The Structure and Content of Training"	Robert J. Brooks, Project Director Law Enforcement Assistance Program Center
7 PM	"Designs for In-Service Training: Illinois System"	George Kiefer, Project Coordinator Illinois In-Service Training

Wednesday, February 28, 1968

9 AM	"Perspectives on the Correctional Officer"	Participants: John A. Mayden, Warden U.S. Penitentiary Marion, Illinois John O' Neil, Investigator Jackson County Legal Service Bureau Craig Martin, Student Southern Illinois University Moderator: Henry Burns, Jr. Instructor Center
1:30 PM	"New Directions in Management Organization"	Fremont A. Shull Visiting Professor of Commerce U. of Wisconsin, Madison
7 PM	"The Case Project"	Richard Pooley, Instructor Center

Thursday, February 29, 1968

9	AM	Sample Presentations I, II, and III	Fleary P. Samples, Instructor Center
1:30	PM	"The Interpretation of Criminal and Prisoner Statistics"	Elmer H. Johnson, Center Assistant Director
3:30	PM	Sample Presentation IV	Fleary P. Samples, Instructor Center
6	PM	Graduation Banquet - Elks Club University and Jackson Street	Speaker: Robert W. MacVicar, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Presentation of Diplomas

Friday, March 1, 1968

9	AM	"Consequences of the Institute"	Center Staff
11:30	AM	Institute Closing	

APPENDIX
IV.

PARTICIPANTS AND SCHEDULE FOR 3rd INSTITUTE
APRIL 1 - MAY 24, 1968

TRAINING OFFICERS
APRIL 1-MAY 24, 1968

Mr. Jerry E. Batten
Hillcrest School of Oregon
2450 Strong Road
Salem, Oregon 97310

Mr. John J. Berry
State House of Correction &
Prison Branch
Marquette, Michigan 49855

Mr. James E. Curran
Montana State Prison
Box 7
Deer Lodge, Montana 59722

Mr. John W. Drennon
Training Officer
Kentucky State Penitentiary
Eddyville, Kentucky 42038

Mr. William J. Foster
Nebraska Penal & Corr. Complex
P.O. Box 11
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

Mr. Martin Green
Jail Division
Public Safety Department
1320 N.W., 14th Street
Miami, Florida 33125

Mr. John F. Harbison
Iowa State Penitentiary
Box 316
Fort Madison, Iowa 52627

Mr. Donald J. Hartley
Massachusetts Correctional Inst.
Bridgewater, Box 366
Bridgewater, Massachusetts 12324

Mr. Richard L. Henderson
Boys Training Center
675 Westbrook Street
South Portland, Maine 04106

Lt. Donald J. Johnson
Oregon State Penitentiary
2605 State Street
Salem, Oregon 97310

Mr. Timothy F. Keohane
Personnel Specialist
Federal Corr. Institution
Lompos, California 93438

Mr. Tom J. Mecum
Training Assistant
Preston School of Industry
R.R., Box 5
Ione, California 95640

Mr. Milton Meeks
Training Officer
The Men's Reform., Box B
Anamosa, Iowa 52205

Mr. Spencer S. Miller
Staff Tng. & Pers. Officer
State of Nebraska
Boys Training School, Box 192
Kearney, Nebraska 68847

Mr. J.D. Netherland
State Farm
State Farm, Virginia 32166

Mr. John T. Owens
Apalachee Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 127
Chattahoochee, Florida 32324

TRAINING OFFICERS
APRIL 1-MAY 24, 1968
Page 2

Mr. McArthur Singletary
MacDougall Youth Corr. Center
Route 1, Box 178
Ridgeville, South Carolina 29472

Lt. Thomas Stone
New Jersey State Prison
Third Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08606

Lt. Benjamin C. Tiller
Illinois State Prison, Menard
P.O. Box 711
Menard, Illinois 62259

Mr. Matthew Joseph Wright
Adult Correctional Institutions
P.O. Box 114
Howard, Rhode Island 02834

SPRING
Staff Training Officers Institute
April 1 - May 24, 1968

WEEK ONE

Differences That Make A Difference

Monday, April 1

9:00 AM Introduction - Orientation - Robert J. Brooks
10:30 AM Pre-Testing - Peter Rompler
1:30 PM Campus Tour - Jim Adams
6:30 PM Film: The Price of a Life - Jordan Goldstein

Tuesday, April 2

9:00 AM Cultural Factors - Peter Rompler
1:30 PM Laboratory

Wednesday, April 3

9:00 AM Class Values and Behavior - Ronald W. VanderWiel
1:30 PM Laboratory
6:30 PM Film: Criminal Justice in the United States - Allan Lammers

Thursday, April 4

9:00 AM Group Considerations in Teaching - John Grenfell Stanley Brodsky, and Sam Samples
1:30 PM Group Considerations in Teaching - Cont'd

Friday, April 5

9:00 AM Group Considerations in Teaching - John Grenfell Stanley Brodsky, and Sam Samples
1:30 PM Group Considerations in teaching - Cont'd

Saturday, April 6

9:00 AM Poverty and Justice - Robert Dreher

WEEK TWO

The Prison Community

Monday, April 8

9:00 AM Prison Community - Organization - Elmer H. Johnson
1:30 PM Laboratory

Tuesday, April 9

9:00 AM Prison Community - Roles - Elmer H. Johnson
1:30 PM Laboratory

Wednesday, April 10

9:00 AM Instructional Media - Duncan Mitchell and Bob White
1:30 PM Laboratory
6:30 PM Instructional Media Workshop - Duncan Mitchell, Richard Pooley, and James Nugent

Thursday, April 11

9:00 AM A New Look at Custody - Frank Wilkerson
1:30 PM Laboratory
6:30 PM Film: Brakes and Misbehavior - Richard Pooley

Friday, April 12

9:00 AM Commission Report on Civil Disorders: A Symposium - Richard Wilhelmy, Frank Wilkerson, Robert J. Brooks, and Peter Rompler
1:30 PM Laboratory

Saturday, April 13

9:00 AM Role of the Correctional Officer - Robert J. Brooks

WEEK THREE

Corrections and Society

Monday, April 15

9:00 AM Legal Basis of Corrections - Robert Dreher
1:30 PM Laboratory
6:30 PM Film: Crime in the Cities - Robert Dreher and Ronald Braithwaite

Tuesday, April 16

9:00 AM The Correctional Process - Robert J. Brooks
1:30 PM Laboratory

Wednesday, April 17

9:00 AM Institutional Programs - Sam Samples
1:30 PM Laboratory
6:30 PM Film: Due Process of Law Denied - Robert Sigler

Thursday, April 18

9:00 AM Counseling Program - Sam Samples
1:30 PM Laboratory

Friday, April 19

9:00 AM Non-Institutional Program - Henry Burns, Jr.
1:30 PM Laboratory
6:30 PM Film: Emotion and Crimes and Discussion of Capital Punishment - Henry Burns, Jr., and Royce Ragland

Saturday, April 20

9:00 AM Organizing for Training - Robert J. Brooks

WEEK FOUR

Corrections and Change

Monday, April 22

9:00 AM Introducing Change into the Correctional Setting - Arthur Prell
1:00 PM Laboratory
6:30 PM Film: The Quiet One - Ronald Braithwaite and Royce Ragland

Tuesday, April 23

9:00 AM Problem Solving - Individual - Harold Grosowsky
1:30 PM Problem Solving - Group - Harold Grosowsky
Film: Twelve Angry Men
6:30 PM Problem Solving - Laboratory - Harold Grosowsky

Wednesday, April 24

9:00 AM Problem Solving - Duncan Mitchell
1:30 PM Laboratory
6:30 PM U.S. Army Films - Robert Sigler

Thursday, April 25

9:00 AM Research and Change - Stanley Brodsky, Royce Ragland, and Elmer H. Johnson

Friday, April 26

RECESS

WEEK FIVE

Resources for Training

Monday, April 29

9:00 AM Inmate Perspectives as a Training Resource - John O'Neil and Fred Mayo
1:30 PM Laboratory

Tuesday, April 30

8:00 AM Institutional Analysis (Visit to Marion Prison) Henry Burns, Jr.
1:30 PM Laboratory

Wednesday, May 1

9:00 AM Maintaining Physical Fitness - Robert Spackman
1:30 PM Laboratory

Thursday, May 2

9:00 AM Measuring Trainee Progress - Peter Rompler
1:30 PM Laboratory

Friday, May 3

9:00 AM People, Environments, and Communications - John F. Twomey
1:30 PM Laboratory

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS
MAY 6-17, 1968

Jerry Lee Bradley
Illinois State Penitentiary
Box 71
Menard, Illinois 62259

Edward Brannon
Manning Corrections Institution
Box 3173
Columbia, South Carolina 29203

Millard Bullock
1314 North 24th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Warren Buzek
2408 West Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

William Coates
Montana State Prison
Box 7
Deer Lodge, Montana 59722

Dan Decker
Iowa State Mens Reformatory
Box B
Anamosa, Iowa 52205

L.E. Edenfield
Apalachee Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 127
Chattahoochee, Florida 32324

William C. Getz
Senior Training Technician
New York State Dept. of Corr.
Alfred E. Smith St. Office Bldg.
Albany, New York 12225

Anna Gunn
Hillcrest School of Oregon
2450 Strong Road
Salem, Oregon 97310

Lloyd Hedges
Adult Correctional Institution
Box 114
Howard, Rhode Island 02834

Ulysses C. Jackson
New Jersey State Home for Boys
Box 500
Jamesburg, New Jersey 08831

Alton Jorgensen
2317 South 15th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Douglas Leggett
Iowa State Mens Reformatory
Box B
Anamosa, Iowa 52205

James Lockhardt
Correctional Officer
State Prison Farm
Rahway, New Jersey 07065

C.H. Maloy
Apalachee Correctional Inst.
P.O. Box 127
Chattahoochee, Florida 32324

John Metcalf
Vermont State Prison and House
of Correction for Men
65 State Street
Windsor, Vermont 05089

John T. Phillips
2036 South 26th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

George Price
Vermont State Prison and House
of Correction for Men
65 State Street
Windsor, Vermont 05089

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS
MAY 6-17, 1968
Page 2

John A. Purdy
Boys Training Center
675 Westbrook Street
South Portland, Maine 04106

Charles Ricketts
Kentucky State Reformatory
LaGrange, Kentucky 40031

Joseph Kenneth Robbins
Botys Training Center
675 Westbrook Street
South Protland, Maine 04106

James R. Severs
Illinois State Penitentiary
Box 711
Menard, Illinois 62259

Gertrude Sharpe
Industrial Farm for Women
Goochland, Virginia 23063

Gerald Simpson
State Road Camp #7
White Post, Virginia 22663

Robert Streetor
Central Correctional Institution
1515 Gist Street
P.O. Box 766
Columbia, South Carolina 29203

Dock Radford Stroud
Kentucky State Penitentiary
Eddyville, Kentucky 42038

Harry Thorpe
Southhampton Correctional Farm
Capron, Virginia 23829

Herschel Turner
Illinois State Penitentiary
Box 711
Menard, Illinois 62259

Otsie Weekly
Hillcrest School of Oregon
2450 Strong Road
Salem, Oregon 97310

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS INSTITUTE
The Practice Teaching Experience

WEEK SIX

Monday, May 6

9:00 AM to NOON		Introduction
2:00 PM	Room A -	Mr. Wright, Objectives and Purposes Of Training
3:00 PM	Room B -	Mr. Singletary, The Correctional Process
6:00 PM	Room A -	Mr. Singletary, Roles, Objectives, and Duties of the Correctional Officer
7:00 PM	Room B -	Mr. Green, Correctional Ethics

Tuesday, May 7

9:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Berry, Modern Trends in Corrections
10:00 AM	Room B -	Mr. Keohane, The Correctional Officer As a Counselor
12:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Batten, The Functions of a Reception and Diagnostic Center
2:00 PM	Room A -	Mr. Tiller, Techniques in Supervising Inmates
3:00 PM	Room B -	Mr. Singletary, The Importance of Communications
6:00 PM	Room A -	Mr. Tiller, Role Playing: The Correctional Officer and the Inmate
7:00 PM	Room B -	Mr. Berry, Role Playing: The Correctional Officer and the Warden

Wednesday, May 8

9:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Batten, Social Services
10:00 AM	Room B -	Mr. Keohane, Work and School Release
12:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Wright, Role Playing: The Correctional Officer with the Academic and Vocational Instructor
2:00 PM	Room A -	Mr. Green, The Effects of Imprisonment
3:00 PM	Room B -	Mr. Wright, Incident and Report Writing

WEEK SIX
Page 2

Wednesday, May 8, Cont'd.

6:00 PM	Room A -	Mr. Tiller, Search and Shakedown
7:00 PM	Room B -	Mr. Berry, Transportation of Inmates

Thursday, May 9

9:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Batten, Segregation and its Alternatives
10:00 AM	Room B -	Mr. Keohane, The Prerelease Guidance Center
12:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Green, The Use of Training Aids
2:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Hartley, Development of Penal Institutions 1870-1968
3:00 AM	Room B -	Mr. Harbison, History of Probation & Parole
6:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Hartley, Understanding Human Behavior
7:00 AM	Room B -	Mr. Miller, Behavioral Control

Friday, May 10

9:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Hartley, Inmate Culture
10:00 AM	Room B -	Mr. Miller, Legal Rights of Inmates
12:00 AM	Room A -	Mr. Stone, Visiting and Mailing Privileges
2:00 PM	Room A -	Mr. Horton, Food, Clothing, and Medical Services
3:00 PM	Room B -	Mr. Horton, The Inmate Economic System
6:00 PM	Room A -	Mr. Stone, Legal Rights of the Correctional Officer
7:00 PM	Room B -	Mr. Curran, Discipline and the Disciplinary Committee

WEEK SEVEN

Monday, May 13, 1968

9 AM Room A - Mr. Stone, Classification and Reclassification
10 AM Room B - Mr. Drennon, Escape Plan
12 AM Room A - Mr. Horton, Counts as it Relates to Institutional Security
2 PM Room A - Mr. Drennon, Institutional and Personal Management
3 PM Room B - Mr. Miller, Inter-Departmental Relations
6 PM Room A - Mr. Harbison, Public and Community Relations
7 PM Room B - Mr. Curran, Institutional Pre-release Programs

Tuesday, May 14, 1968

9 AM Room A - Mr. Harbison, Role of Probation and Parole as Related to Institution and Community
10 AM Room B - Mr. Drennon, Function of the Jail System
12 AM Room A - Mr. Curran, Review of the Kerner Commission Report
2 PM Room A - Mr. Foster, Development of Penal Institutions Prior to 1870
3 PM Room B - Mr. Netherland, Types of Inmates
6 PM Room A - Mr. Mecum, Creativity in a Correctional Institution
7 PM Room B - Mr. Mecum, Progress Report Writing

Wednesday, May 15, 1968

9 AM Room A - Mr. Henderson, Educational and Vocational Programs
10 AM Room B - Mr. Owens, Institutional Industrial Programs
12 AM Room A - Mr. Mecum, Group Counseling
2 PM Room A - Mr. Henderson, Role Playing: Correctional Officer and Social Worker
3 PM Room B - Mr. Foster, Role Playing: Correctional Officer, Probation Officer and Employer
6 PM Room A - Mr. Henderson, Role Playing: Probation and Parole Officer, and Parolee
7 PM Room B - Mr. Meeks, Recreation and Leisure Time Activities

Thursday, May 16, 1968

9 AM Room A - Mr. Meeks, Mental and Physical Fitness
10 AM Room B - Mr. Netherland, Safety and Sanitation Procedures
12 AM Room A - Mr. Owens, First Aid
2 PM Room A - Mr. Foster, Contraband
3 PM Room B - Mr. Meeks, Self Defense
6 PM Room A - Mr. Netherland, Key and Tool Control
7 PM Room B - Mr. Johnson, Prevention of Riots

Friday, May 17, 1968

9 AM Room A - Mr. Johnson, Riot Control
10 AM Room B - Mr. Johnson, Gas and Weapons Control and Use
11 AM LUNCH
12 AM Room A - Mr. Meeks, Community Resources and Volunteer Groups

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS
MAY 20-24, 1968

John A. Chmielinski
Department of Correction
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
State Office Building Govt. Center
100 Cambridge Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02202

Henry E. Cowan
Kentucky State Penitentiary
Eddyville, Kentucky 42038

Robert William Cunningham
Assistant Director
Organization & Administration
Canadian Penitentiary Service
Justice Building
Ottawa 4, Canada

Lawrence E. Dugger
Sumter Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 667
Bushness, Florida 33513

Leonard F. Horan
Central Office
Alfred E. Smith
State Office Building
Albany, New York 12225

Charles Houston
State Home for Boys
Jamesburg, New Jersey

Robert E. Houle
Adult Correctional Institutions
P.O. Box 114
Howard, Rhode Island 02834

G.G. Jefferson
State Convict Road Force
500 Spring Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Ronald B. Jones
Rt. 6, Box 38 C
Lincoln, Nebraska

Lewis C. Lence
Menard Penitentiary
P.O. Box 711
Menard, Illinois 62259

John T. McCarty, Superintendent
Boy's Training School
Kearney, Nebraska

Leo E. McCracken
State of Oklahoma
Department of Oklahoma
Plaza Court Building
1100 Classen Drive
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73103

Ira C. McKenzie
Division of Corrections Central Office
301 Farris Bryant Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

James Menke
Iowa State Penitentiary
Box 316
Fort Madison, Iowa 52627

Donald S. Mohr
Iowa State Men's Reformatory
Anamosa, Iowa

Walter W. Redman, Jr.
New Castle Correctional Inst.
Wilmington, Delaware 19808

Jack O. Sandstrom
Dade County Public Safety Dept.
Jail and Corrections
Miami, Florida

Wade E. Scott, Sr.
Hillcrest School of Oregon
2450 Strong Road
Salem, Oregon 97310

Maurice H. Sigler, Warden
P.O. Box 111
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

Rallie M. Seigler
Reception & Evaluation Center
1434 Lincoln Street
Box 766
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS INSTITUTE

WEEK EIGHT

Monday, May 20

9:00 AM	Introduction to the Institute	Charles V. Matthews, Center Director Robert J. Brooks, Project Director
1:30 PM	"Raising Anxiety Levels as Tools for Training"	C.R. Dodge, Employee Training Specialist Colorado Youth Services Denver, Colorado

Tuesday, May 21

8:30 AM	"Training: Where to? What Next?"	Robert J. Brooks
10:30 AM	"The Uses of Criminal and Prisoner Statistics in Management Planning"	Elmer H. Johnson, Center Assistant Director
1:30 PM	Sample Presentations	Fleary Samples, Instructor

Wednesday, May 22

9:00 AM	"Recent Developments in Capital Punishment"	Henry Burns, Jr., Instructor
10:30 AM	"Training Tools: The Background of Corrections", a 35mm slide presentation	Allan Lammers, Research Assistant
1:30 PM	"New Directions in Management Organization"	Fremont A. Shull, Visiting Professor of Commerce University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS INSTITUTE

WEEK EIGHT

Wednesday, May 22, Cont'd.

7:00 PM "Frontier Programs in Correctional Education and Training" — Richard Pooley, Instructor

Miss Elinor Gollay
Mr. David Bornstein
Abt. Associates, Inc.
Cambridge, Mass.

Thursday, May 23

8:30 AM* "National Advisory Commission Report on Civil Disorders: A Symposium"

James Graves, M.D.
Psychiatrist, Detroit

Peter O. Rompler,
Sociologist
Instructor, Center

Richard Wilhelmy,
Law Enforcement Consultant

Robert J. Brooks,
Moderator

Frank Wilkerson,
Treatment Director
Detroit House of Correction

1:30 PM "The Mental Health Professional in Correctional Settings: Colleague or Critic?"

Speakers: Charles Hendry, M.D.
Psychiatrist
U.S. Penitentiary, Marion

Stanley Brodsky,
Assistant Professor, Center

Panel: John E. Grenfell,
Associate Professor, Center

John Twomey,
Assistant Professor, Center

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATORS INSTITUTE

WEEK EIGHT

Friday, May 24

9:00 AM	"Consequences of the Institute"	Project Staff
11:00 AM	Institute Closing	